

BUREAU OF ENVIRONMENT CONFERENCE REPORT

SUBJECT: Monthly SHPO-FHWA-ACOE-NHDOT Cultural Resources Meeting

DATE OF CONFERENCES: August 1 & 7, 2013

LOCATION OF CONFERENCE: John O. Morton Building

ATTENDED BY:

NHDOT

John Butler
Sheila Charles
Victoria Chase
Keith Cota
Ron Crickard
Jill Edelmann
Cathy Goodmen
Bob Hudson
Tom Jameson
Bob Juliano
Bob Landry
Marc Laurin
Kevin Nyhan
Pete Stamnas
Jerry Zoller

**Army Corps
of Engineers**
Rich Roach

**Federal Highway
Administration**

Jamie Sikora
MaryAnn Nabor (on
phone)

NHDHR

Laura Black
Edna Feighner

Albacore Park
Ken Herrick

City of Concord
Ed Roberge
Martha Drukker

CHA

John Parrelli

**Fitzgerald &
Halliday, Inc.**
Stephanie Dyer-
Carroll

Goffstown DPW
Carl Quiram

**Hartgen
Archaeological**
Matt Kirk

HDR
Jim Murphy

Haynor-Swanson
John Vancor

Hoyle, Tanner
Mathew Low
Kimberly Peace

**McFarland
Johnson**

Vicki Chase
Gene McCarthy

Stantec

Gerald Fortin
Michael Leach

Town of Henniker
Tom Yennerell

**Consulting/
Interested Parties**

James Garvin
Nathan Holth (via
phone)
Audra Klumb
Roy Schweiker

(When viewing these minutes online, click on an attendee to send an e-mail)

PROJECTS/PRESENTATIONS REVIEWED THIS MONTH:

(minutes on subsequent pages)

August 1, 2013	1
Wolfeboro 16107 (no federal number)	2
Goffstown, X-A002(052), 20246	2
Newcastle-Rye, X-A001(146), 16127	4
Nashua, NRBD-5315(021), 10040A	7
August 7, 2013	8
Concord, BRF-X-5099(021), 12004	8
Henniker, X-A003(046), 15718	12
Portsmouth, STP-X-5379(025), 13455	13

(When viewing these minutes online, click on a project to zoom to the minutes for that project)

August 1, 2013

Wolfeboro 16107 (no federal number)**Participants: Participants: Gerard Fortin, Michael Leach, Stantec; Ron Crickard, NHDOT**

A large scale plan, depicting the reconstruction of NH Route 28 (aka Center Street) from Pickering Corner to Willow Street, with photographs of the existing buildings along the proposed route was displayed with the impacts to properties with buildings older than 50 years colored on the plan. Gerard Fortin opened the meeting stating the project is a State Aid Highway funded roadway reconstruction project. The project proposes the reconstruction the existing roadway from just south of Pickering Corner to just north of Willow Street with the installation of new drainage, reconstruction of the sidewalks and minor water and sewer improvements by the Town. The project will adjust the existing intersection at Lehner Street and Pine Street to about ten (10) feet to the east to allow for improvements to the sight distance at the intersection. The alignment shift for the intersection will impact a few of the properties along the easterly side of the roadway. G. Fortin noted that the project would impact six properties older than 50 years and that Michael Leach would explain more.

M. Leach indicated that the project would impact six properties with buildings older than 50 years and the six locations were colored on the plan. The color scheme was orange for access driveways, green for landscaping and purple for sidewalk. All of the colored improvements shown were outside the existing ROW and were minimal impacts to match to the existing driveways and landscape areas on the lots. The impact at each lot was explained. After explaining each location, M. Leach asked if there were any questions.

Edna Feigner noted that there were no archeological concerns. Laura Black noted there were some buildings at the northerly end of the project of potential significance but that there were not any impacts to these properties under the proposed project. The roadway would be narrowed in this northern area. L. Black asked if this area was reviewed for a historical district. M. Leach noted that a portion of the project was reviewed as Wolfeboro Falls area in 1998 and it was determined as not eligible. The survey area started at Grove Street and went north beyond the project limits. L. Black asked if the southerly portion was reviewed for a district. Jill Edelmann noted this area is a generally modern business area and not likely eligible as a district. G. Fortin noted there were two shopping centers in the area. M. Leach noted this southerly area has a bank, a Dunkin Donuts, a duplex residence and the two gas stations located at Pickering Corner just beyond the project limits. M. Leach noted that there is also an antique shop and a dentist office and that is area is predominantly commercial. After further discussion about a district, the consensus was that the project would result in a No Historic Properties Affected finding.

M. Leach noted that an effect memo would be prepared stating historic or archaeological properties will be affected and have the memo sent to NHDOT for signature. M. Leach noted the minutes for the meeting would also be prepared and sent for the next meeting.

Goffstown, X-A002(052), 20246**Participants: Brian Colburn, Mike Long, Vicki Chase, McFarland Johnson; Carl Quiram, Town of Goffstown DPW; Bob Hudson, DOT**

Initial consultation for an intersection improvement project in Goffstown. The project involves two intersections of Route 114 and NH Route 13. The current proposed alternative involves traffic calming improvements with limited footprints all within the current road right of way. The proposed improvements are as follows:

The northern intersection, which includes North Mast Road, High Street, Elm Street, and Main Street, would have the following modifications:

- Formalized angled parking along North Mast Road in front of Sully's Market, with an eastbound left turn lane into the market parking lot.
- Addition of pedestrian crosswalks and pedestrian refuges.
- Addition of a right turn lane on Elm Street westbound.
- Addition of a sidewalk on the north side of North Mast Road.

The southern intersection includes Pleasant Street, Main Street, Mountain road, and South Mast Road. The intersection would be improved with the following traffic calming measures:

- Providing better intersection definition by enlarging the existing green areas and narrowing of the northbound and southbound lanes of Main Street.
- Relocation of the northern crosswalk to provide additional sight distance and a pedestrian refuge at the north end of the raised island.
- Shortening of the crosswalk across Mountain Road.
- Addition of a sidewalk along Main Street between Pleasant Street and Mountain Road.
- Realignment of the entrance of Carr Court onto Main Street, and elimination of the north/south portion of Carr Court. This will likely require relocation of the existing stone watering trough southward and will be coordinated with the property owner of 1 Carr Court.

The APEs of both intersections are adjacent to several historic buildings. The northern intersection APE has two listed properties and lies within a listed historic district (Goffstown Main Street Historic District). A second larger NR eligible district (Goffstown Village Historic District) includes both intersections. Laura Black noted that the RPR had omitted some of the eligible and/or contributing properties, and requested that the files at DHR be reviewed again to confirm the status of the historic properties at both intersections. She also noted that the age of the Catholic Church at 1 E. Union St appeared to be incorrect, as it was more likely a mid-century building.

Laura Black requested that information about the history of the common area between the two portions of South Main Street the Carr Street Historic District be provided to DHR. Laura Black noted that there may be some additional inventory undertaken to confirm the eligibility of properties within the APE for the project. Carl Quiram noted that the proposed project would have a limited impact on the historic properties in Goffstown, as all work would be conducted within the road right of way.

Edna Feighner had no concerns about archaeological resources for the project.

McFarland Johnson planned to provide the following to DHR in an RPR addendum:

1. Confirmation of the status of the historic resources at both intersections, such as which ones have been inventoried and which have had eligibility determinations made.
2. Confirmation of the age of the Catholic Church at the southern intersection.
3. Available information about the local Carr Street Historic District at the southern intersection.
4. Available information about the past use of the common area and historical configuration of the southern intersection.
5. Copies of project plans.

Newcastle-Rye, X-A001(146), 16127

Participants: Stephanie Dyer-Carroll, Fitzgerald & Halliday; James Murphy, HDR; Matt Kirk, Hartgen Archaeological; Victoria Chase, Bob Juliano, Marc Laurin, NHDOT

The first coordination meeting with SHPO on the New Castle-Rye Bridge Project was held on August 1, 2013 at NHDOT. Attendees introduced themselves and a brief presentation was provided on the status of the project.

Jim Murphy, a Project Engineer with HDR, explained that the Inspection and Condition Report for the bridge was completed in 2011. In 2012, NHDOT began investigating rehabilitation/replacement options. In early 2013, a Project Advisory Committee (PAC) was established; two PAC meetings have occurred to date, in January and July of 2013. This summer an engineering report was completed and a public meeting is planned for August 14, 2013

Stephanie Dyer-Carroll, a Planner and Cultural Resources Specialist with FHI, updated SHPO on progress to date in the areas of Natural, Historical, and Archaeological Resources. Coordination letters were sent to various state and federal environmental agencies in the winter and spring of 2013. In addition, a coordination meeting to introduce the project to environmental resource agencies was held in March 2013 at NHDOT. Field survey and coordination has identified three wetland areas, an eelgrass bed, and threatened and endangered species in the vicinity of the bridge. These species include both the Atlantic and shortnose sturgeon. In addition, the Marsh Elder and Bald Eagle have been identified just outside of the project area. The bridge design will seek to avoid or minimize impacts to the wetlands and eelgrass beds. In addition, construction will seek to avoid disrupting sturgeon habitat, specifically during the spawning season.

NHDOT prepared a Request for Project Review form and submitted it to the SHPO in January 2013. The form defined an Area of Potential Effect (APE) for the project; the area was defined based on the potential for visual impacts to surrounding properties from the improvements to the bridge and as such is fairly broad. Research identified the Wentworth-Coolidge Mansion (NHL) and the Wentworth by the Sea Hotel (NR Eligible) within the APE. An Individual Inventory Form was also prepared for the bridge in order to evaluate its eligibility for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. NHDOT determined that the bridge is eligible under Criterion A for its association with the defense of Portsmouth Harbor in World War II, and under Criterion C as one of two remaining bascule bridges in the State of New Hampshire. In addition, fieldwork has been completed for a Phase 1A Archaeological Study and a report is underway. The survey identified one of the abutments from the 1874 bridge within the APE.

Jim Murphy then gave a brief presentation on the bridge and the alternatives currently under consideration for its rehabilitation or replacement. He explained that a bridge inspection was undertaken in 2011 that determined the bridge has structural deficiencies including advanced section loss in the pier caps and piles, the stringers and bascule girders, and the approach span stringers. Additional deficiencies include the fact that the bascule machinery doesn't meet code, the sidewalks and shoulders are narrow, and the open deck is noisy and a hazard to bicyclists. Furthermore, there are safety issues as pedestrians must cross the road on the north roadway approach to use the bridge's sidewalk.

The following alternatives were outlined as potential options for the rehabilitation or replacement of the bridge:

- Alternative 1 – Existing Horizontal Alignment/Existing Profile (Rehabilitation)
- Alternative 2 – Existing Horizontal Alignment/Raised Profile, Fixed Bridge (Replacement)
- Alternative 3 – Shifted Horizontal Alignment (Replacement)
- Alternative 4 – Offline Horizontal Alignment (Replacement)

Rehabilitation under Alternative 1 would require the strengthening of the deck, the approach stringers, the bascule span floorbeams, the bascule girders, the pier caps, and the pier piles. In addition, the bridge railings require replacement, an approach slab may be necessary at the abutments, and the electrical systems require replacement. New mechanical components would be required to meet modern standards and the machinery and trunnion may not allow for a solid deck.

This alternative would match the existing bridge in its alignment and profile, and would not align the north approach sidewalk with the bridge sidewalk. The paved roadway shoulder width would be increased from 1 to 2 feet and the sidewalk width would be increased from 4 to 5 feet. A full bridge closure and off-site detour would be required during the 6-8 month period of construction however the feasibility of alternating one lane of traffic will be investigated during the construction of the approach superstructure. The estimated cost of this option is \$17M and the expected life of the bridge would be 30-40 years. NHDOT has determined that they will continue to evaluate the rehabilitation option.

Alternative 2 would construct a new bridge, raising the existing profile to allow for a fixed span. A profile increase of 6'-3" was investigated, and is based on the minimum requirement of active US Coast Guard (USCG) vessels. With a 6'-3" increase in profile, this alternative would require significant driveway tie-ins, new retaining walls up to 13 feet in height, and additional work in the water. It also could impact the Amurcork tree on the southwest side of the bridge and would require full bridge closure and a detour during construction. Due to the magnitude of site disturbance, NHDOT will likely eliminate this alternative from further consideration.

Under Alternative 3, a new bridge would be constructed that matches the vertical geometry of the existing roadway. It would widen the approach area to the bridge on the west side, and shift the centerline of the roadway 6'-9" to the west. This would allow for wider roadway shoulders and the relocation of the sidewalk to the east side of the bridge. This alternative would require a full bridge closure and off-site detour during the 3-4 month construction period. The estimated cost of this

alternative is \$20M and the expected life of the bridge is 75 years. NHDOT intends to continue to evaluate this replacement option.

Under Alternative 4, a new bridge would be constructed that would be located 17'-5" to the west of the existing alignment. This alternative would have the greatest environmental impacts to the harbor and stonewalls, as well as the Amurcork tree. The bridge would remain open with one lane of traffic during the majority of construction however the construction period would be substantially longer than Alternative 3. Due to the potential environmental impacts, NHDOT will likely eliminate this alternative from further consideration.

HDR indicated that construction on the bridge will begin in 2016, not before the Sagamore Bridge is reopened. The detour during construction will add approximately 15 minutes of travel time and 6 miles. NHDOT will seek to limit the bridge closure period and schedule construction to minimize impacts to mobility, environmental resources, marine navigation, and area businesses.

At the closure of the meeting, the consultant team identified key next steps in process, including a public information meeting to be held on August 14th, 2013, the completion of the Type, Size and Location Study in December 2013, and the review of this study at a PAC meeting in January 2014. Over 600 people have been invited through direct mail postcards to attend the public information meeting.

Throughout the meeting, attendees asked questions and offered information or concerns. The comments and questions were as follows:

- FHWA asked how many properties abut the bridge. The consultant team indicated that there are two private residences on the Rye side of the bridge. The Wentworth by the Sea Hotel and Marina lie on the New Castle side of the bridge.
- FHWA asked whether there are sidewalks on the north and south sides of the bridge. The consultant team stated that there's a wide shoulder on the southeast side and a sidewalk on the northeast side. The bridge sidewalk lies on the west side of the structure.
- FHWA asked about the necessary detour during construction. The consultant team indicated that the detour would add approximately six miles, or 15 minutes, to commutes.
- SHPO asked whether staging areas have been determined. They stated that they prefer these areas to be paved. NHDOT indicated that the project will be completed through the CM/GC process, thereby allowing them to determine the staging areas early. NHDOT believes the project will be staged from the water, likely using a barge. Once the staging areas have been determined, NHDOT will undertake additional archaeological survey if it's determined to be necessary.
- NHDOT asked the archaeologists whether a Phase 1B survey of the area will be recommended. The consultant team stated that a Phase 1B is not being recommended, as the area is primarily fill. However, one of the abutments for the 1874 bridge does lie within the APE.
- USACE asked whether the lengthening of the bridge has been looked at. The consultant team indicated that they have concerns about silting and runoff.
- SHPO stated that Inventory Forms may be necessary for adjacent properties on the Rye side. NHDOT thinks that it may be too soon to make this determination, that it should wait

until the preferred alternative has been defined. SHPO indicated that preparing them now would ensure that this doesn't impact the project schedule. They stated that if the bridge work encroaches on the property lines, or impacts mature landscaping or stone walls, NHDOT should come back to discuss the preparation of additional inventory forms.

- SHPO asked about the visibility of the bridge from the Wentworth-Coolidge National Historic Site and whether the APE could be reduced if Alternative 2 is ruled out. The consultant team indicated that the bridge is viewed from a substantial distance across the water, and that the view is of the entire bridge in profile. The elimination of Alternative 2 would not narrow the APE.
- SHPO asked whether consulting parties have been identified. The consultant team indicated that members of the PAC have already expressed an interest in being consulting parties. FHWA suggested that we have a handout available at the public meeting that describes how individuals can become consulting parties in the process.
- USACE stated that the raised profile or off-alignment options are not really viable.
- USACE also indicated that the USCG should be invited to the public meeting.
- SHPO asked whether the two properties on the Rye side are over 50 years old. The consultant team indicated that they are, based on the town property records and on historic maps. SHPO stated that they don't know whether they are eligible or not.

Nashua, NRBD-5315(021), 10040A

Participants: John Vancor, Hayner-Swanson; Marc Laurin, Pete Stamnas, NHDOT

Continued consultation and discussion of the draft design guidelines and an update was provided on the effort to establish design guidelines in accordance with the MOA.

In an effort to respond to feedback requesting additional detail, the City recently submitted a second draft to NHDOT. This second draft focused on engineering elements of the Parkway design alone. In providing this document, it was noted that the City's understanding is that the guideline document is intended to pertain to design of the Parkway alone.

Prior to the coordination meeting, NHDOT indicated that it is their understanding that the intention of the scope of the guidelines is greater than just the Parkway alone. The intention is to provide guidelines which could serve as a helpful resource for private property owners within the historic districts as redevelopment may occur.

NHDOT considered that the first draft submitted by the City outlined relevant background information and the second addressed specifics of the Parkway itself. NHDOT considered that what remained were guidelines for the future beyond the limits of the Parkway project. These guidelines will not be a mandate, but rather a resource for reference.

Shelia Charles of NHDOT prepared a draft document dated July 31, 2013 which compiled and appended information from the previous City drafts and provides a framework for completing a document which can serve as a reference for the future. NHDOT presented this draft document.

All attendees agreed that a significant effort had been made by NHDOT in preparing this draft. Discussion reviewed options for lighting, fencing and landscaping described in the draft. It was agreed that inclusion of additional historic photos would be beneficial if available. It was agreed that work on these guidelines will continue as actual construction on the Parkway moves forward.

John Vancor provided an update on design development. Design of the Fairmount Street Bridge is nearly complete. This bridge will include bid alternatives for a possible visual upgrade of the bridge rail, as well as form-liner treatment of concrete surfaces.

Similar to provisions made for Baldwin Street, the timber beams from the Fairmount Street Bridge will be preserved for possible reuse on other City projects. Unlike Baldwin Street however, the timber decking on the Fairmount Street Bridge is in poor condition according to a structural condition assessment by Fay, Spofford & Thorndike and this decking will not be stockpiled for reuse.

The River Bridge design is nearly complete. Bid alternatives will also be included in bid documents for this bridge for visual upgrade of the bridge rail and treatment of concrete surfaces.

August 7, 2013

Concord, BRF-X-5099(021), 12004

Participants: Ed Roberge, Martha Drukker, City of Concord; Rob Faulkner, John Parrelli, CHA; Richard Casella, Historic Document Co.; Gene McCarthy, McFarland Johnson; Cathy Goodman, Tom Jameson, Kevin Nyhan, Jerry Zoller, NHDOT; Consulting Parties: Jim Garvin, Nathan Holth, Audra Klumb, Roy Schweiker

Ed Roberge started by discussing the condition of the bridge. The bridge has recently been down posted to 3 tons and for passenger vehicles only. There is concern that the bridge may not survive the winter and that it may need to be closed.

Ed Roberge also noted that he has received comments from the consulting parties and thanked them for the quick turnaround. Ed is going to focus on responding to the comments and move on to the next steps.

John Parrelli summarized the Alternatives Analysis that was released on July 19th. He noted that the document summarized the many alternatives that have been developed since the start of the project. The document then breaks out and discusses in more detail the current alternative and how it relates to the City's Purpose and Need.

Jamie Sikora brought up the question regarding what assumptions were used in estimating future maintenance costs.

John Parrelli handed out, and later emailed to Nathan Holth, the Estimated Maintenance / Preservation costs for the rehabbed bridge and the new bridge. These were developed in 2010

when Alternative H was the preferred option and they include details on how the estimates were established.

Ed Roberge discussed the Purpose & Need and noted that the project has evolved from the original statement in 1998. The Purpose & Need has been updated to comply with the new street policy as well as the City's Master Plan.

Nathan Holth asked about the bridge alternatives as regards pedestrians. If the preserved bridge would be used only as a pedestrian bridge, would there need to be the same consideration when rehabilitating, and could the new bridge be built without a sidewalk? Since there would not be any traffic would it therefore be subject to less fatigue.

Ed Roberge responded that even if the bridge was used just for pedestrians, the deck and rails would still need to be replaced. The City would still need to plow and salt the bridge for safety reasons. He stated it would not be wise to construct a new bridge without a sidewalk because the truss would eventually need to be removed in the future.

Jamie Sikora agrees that the steel truss bridge would not have a comparable service life as a more modern bridge design built with new steel.

Roy Schweiker stated that the City does not maintain its sidewalks. Ed Roberge noted that the City has a 3 tier policy for snow removal.

Jamie Sikora said that there would be a municipal agreement since this is a federal aid project.

There was a discussion on mitigation. It will be discussed after determination of adverse effects.

Jim Garvin suggested that Section 106 mandates preservation. Ed Roberge noted that Section 106 is a process. Jamie Sikora noted that the Alternatives Analysis is not only used for evaluating Section 106 resources, but also the evaluation of Section 4f and other resources.

Ed Roberge noted that the 2010 alternative was selected on the assumption that it was technically feasible to rehab the bridge, an assumption that lacked engineering data. Without a study being completed, it was not known just how compromised the condition of the bridge was and is. The 2010 analysis should have included a full inspection. Now we have the data to come to a conclusion. While it is technically feasible to rehab the bridge, it is not prudent.

Audra Klum suggested that a rehab in place is the least costly option.

Ed Roberge noted that the rehab in place option was dismissed because it does not meet the City's Purpose and Need.

NHDHR commented that in the project goals there is no mention of preservation of resources. Purpose and Need was not meant to shift from previous, but was updated as the use has changed.

Ed Roberge mentioned that they have heard from the public that nobody wants impacts to the LCIP property and people want traffic calming.

Ed Roberge thanked responders for all of their comments. If there are any other comments, they should be sent to the City. He still feels strongly that replacement is the best alternative and would like concurrence and is looking forward to discussing mitigation.

Roy Schweiker noted that he does not know the federal rules and would like to know if some federal regulation requires the bridge to be retained.

Jamie Sikora stated that Section 106 is procedural and 4f has more “teeth”. It requires avoiding or minimizing impacts if reasonable alternatives exist, as former conclusion was made without good data, the City has provided information to show this and the NEPA document will need to be updated.

Kevin Nyhan noted that comments should be taken under advisement and the City can issue recommendations for FHEA to make the decision to move forward.

Jim Garvin stated that the City needs to prove that there is no feasible / prudent alternative and should address what option will have the least harm.

Jamie Sikora noted that this will be addressed in the NEPA document and is confident the final NEPA document will capture the alternative analysis – including avoidance and minimization efforts.

Jim Garvin stated that Section 106 mandates that adverse effects be avoided / minimized. Kevin Nyhan noted that this will be addressed in the NEPA document.

Jim Garvin commented that there was no mistake in 2010 by not doing an inspection of the bridge. The degree of deterioration is not surprising and is similar to the Patterson Hill Bridge in Henniker. As DHR noted, the best way to look at future maintenance is to look at similar bridges that have rehabbed instead of using theoretical formulas. Places to check these values would be the Vermont Bridge Preservation Program and the Historic Bridge Foundation.

Jim Garvin also noted that “prudent” has a specific definition in regards to 4f.

Ed Roberge noted that he will look for data costs but not sure the data set is out there. He will look in good faith effort as DHR requested.

Jim Garvin commented that there is a reference to existing major corridor and future development. He noted that the neighborhood appreciated traffic calming from the one lane bridge. He asked what the local viewpoints were of Sewalls Falls Road being a major crossing. His key point was that if the City plans to transform this area and crossing, this should be clearly stated.

Robert Faulkner stated that traffic calming or a one lane bridge were never considered as part of this project, and it was always intended to build a two lane bridge – either with two one-lane spans or one tow-lane spans. The bridge was always intended to be a fully functional major collector crossing.

Jim Garvin also noted that there are many comments that the document is insufficient.

Laura Black clarified comments in our recent NHDHR letter: Since 2012 the project has been all about the poor condition of the bridge and the focus has been on safety considerations and structural problems. Black supported Jim Garvin's and Audra Klumb's comments regarding the increased focus on neighborhood transformation and the necessity to clearly share that with the public.

Kevin Nyhan stated that the structural issues are all still there and are real issues and part of the Purpose and Needs are development and transportation issues. He noted that the Master Plan is a public process as well. This is a bridge project and not the place to discuss master plan issues and that the alternatives analysis should address the big picture and not just scary details.

Kevin Nyhan also noted that CHA's report and cost information is enough to support a NEPA document.

Ed Roberge noted that the last Zoning Ordinance was done in 2001 and Sewalls Falls Road is a regional connector. He commented that continued downposts have created traffic calming. The Master Plan is an all public process and notes Exit 16½ as well as Whitney Avenue.

Ed Roberge noted that this last document was in response to the request to include more information. Now the response is that the information has been watered down and changed. Ed also noted that there was not a Purpose and Need when the previous alternative was accepted back in 2010. He expressed that we need to advance this project. Having a full capacity bridge was the plan and that has not changed.

Kevin Nyhan stated that moving forward, comments and recommendations will be addressed in a response document not in a NEPA document. Consulting parties have commented and this project is eligible for 4f.

Jamie Sikora stated FHWA is comfortable with the current information to make a decision.

Martha Drukker asked DHR if they liked the process. Kevin Nyhan stated that the Section 106 process has been followed and the basis for decision making is solid. Jamie Sikora noted that DHR concurrence is not required but would prefer agreement.

Ed Roberge said the City will respond to comments and finalize a report to FHWA/NHDOT to request final determination.

Jerry Zoller suggested adding 3 ton posting and voiced concern of the bridge not lasting the winter. Laura Black agreed that bridge is now in bad condition and safety should be addressed.

Ed Roberge stated that if there were any additional comments for the City to send them along so they can be addressed. Roy Schweiker said he will send three more written comments.

Henniker, X-A003(046), 15718

Participants: Matthew J. Low, Kimberly Peace, Hoyle, Tanner & Associates; Tom Yennerell, Town of Henniker; Interested Party: Roy Schweiker

M. Low began by providing an overview of the Western Avenue Bridge project and cultural resource documentation which has been prepared and provided to date. This project has been presented at two prior meetings, one in April 2010 and one in May 2012, which were both during the Engineering Study portion of the project development process. As a result of those earlier meetings, the following documentation has been prepared by Hoyle, Tanner's team:

- Individual Inventory Forms for two residential properties nearby the project location prepared by Historic Documentation Company, Inc. (HDC).
- Area Form for the West Henniker area also prepared by HDC.

Although the work concluded that nearly all residences were not individually register-eligible (41 Patterson Hill Road has no determination yet as more information is required), they contribute to the district. The project would have no direct impact on these properties.

Also prepared from an archaeological standpoint were:

- A Phase IA Archaeological Assessment as part of the Engineering Study phase of the project by Independent Archaeological Consultants, LLC.(IAC). This report recommended further investigation of the proposed project impact areas with a Phase IB assessment. The Phase IB assessment was recently completed.

The results of the Phase IB assessment were that only one "area" in the project footprint is significant from an archaeological perspective. This area is designated as Area A and is located in the northwest quadrant of the project, near the site of a former mill / industrial site. IAC has recommended that impacts to this area be avoided and that the area be delineated during construction to ensure the contractor does not impact the area. M. Low provided a sketch provided by IAC showing a demarcation line that illustrates the limit of the sensitive area. Hoyle, Tanner has revised the layout of the northwest wing wall from a splayed wall to a u-back configuration to further minimize the potential for excavation impacts to the sensitive area.

M. Low added that Hoyle, Tanner has prepared a draft Bridge Rehabilitation / Replacement Alternatives Evaluation for review by NHDOT Bureau of Environment. M. Low provided a copy to J. Edelmann for review. After NHDOT review and comment, the document will be revised and provided to NHDHR for their review. L. Black asked why this bridge could not be rehabilitated. M. Low provided a sketch (included in the Alternatives Evaluation) that illustrates the amount of work required on the bridge to rehabilitate the structure. Essentially, the only remaining components of the truss would be the top chords and top lateral bracing. The rest of the bridge is so deteriorated that it would require replacement. This was discussed at the first two meetings as well, of which, the first meeting also included former architectural historian Jim Garvin. L. Black will review the Alternatives Evaluation once received.

M. Low asked if the project is now at the point where an Effect Memo, Memorandum of Agreement and mitigation could be discussed. L. Black pointed out that once a determination is made on the Alternatives Evaluation is made, mitigation can be discussed. M. Low mentioned that the Henniker Historical Society was invited to be a consulting party, but declined. L. Black and E. Feighner both pointed out that mitigation should be based upon local involvement. M. Low and T. Yennerell both committed to reaching out to the Historical Society and HDC for their input. Ideas that were discussed at the meeting for mitigation included: a truss maintenance document / program, interpretive signing, and documentation of the bridge. L. Black stated that mitigation is generally targeted towards the lost resource. There was also some discussion, regarding the Secretary's Standards and how that related to new construction within the historic district.

The next steps in the project will be to investigate mitigation at a local level, complete the Alternatives Evaluation, and then return to a future meeting to discuss details of the bridge structure and project further. At that time, it would be anticipated that an Effect Memo and Memorandum of Agreement could be contemplated.

Portsmouth, STP-X-5379(025), 13455

Participants: John Butler, Keith Cota, Bob Landry, NHDOT; Juliet Walker, City of Portsmouth (via telephone); Gene McCarthy, Vicki Chase, McFarland Johnson; Ken Herrick, Albacore Park & Friends of Albacore; Mary Ann Nabor, FHWA (via telephone)

Jill Edelman indicated comments had been received on the matrix she assembled regarding the effects on the USS Albacore. Participants were in consensus that Albacore Park is not eligible. The reviewing parties had come to different conclusions regarding the effect the National Historic Landmark, USS Albacore, and consequently NPS and ACHP had been notified of the disputes on the effects and that we were seeking input.

MaryAnn Nabor indicated both ACHP and NPS need to be notified. For review, they requested a complete package with project information, including information on the disagreement of effect.

Bob Landry asked about the timeline turnaround. Mary Ann Nabor confirmed the timeline includes 15 days for their written response, although they can request a 15 day extension.

Jamie Sikora affirmed that FHWA will make the final determination of effect and subsequently let the public know.

Mary Ann Nabor noted the public, particularly the consulting parties, should also have access to files to facilitate discussion. Jill Edelman indicated the data can be placed on the NHDOT project website. Bob Landry asked if there was a time limit for gathering the public response. Jamie Sikora indicated that there was no time limit.

Jaime Sikora indicated he thought that the NEPA approval could not be issued without construction funding, which is not in STIP. Bob Landry disagreed. He indicated we can get it in STIP in the 10 year plan.

Jaime Sikora indicated there will be a separate NEPA conclusion for the Albacore Connector Road, and it will be a Categorical Exclusion.

Jill Edelmann will assemble another matrix (by 8/16 if possible) regarding the determination of the effect on the Route 1 Bypass. Participants concurred with the data. The project involved no roadway widening, just stripping and use is not changing. Ultimately, signals would be required to handle traffic flow. Cars in the past were stopped at the toll booths. Lights were added. Keith Cota noted access modifications also resulted from private abutters. As such, these actions do not diminish the character defining features of the Bypass.

Next step is for FHWA, NHDHR and consulting parties to review the data, and respond with comments 30 days from July 25th. If adverse effect is determined, we need to start MOA discussions.

Ken Herrick of Albacore Park indicated a letter had already been sent in response, and no negotiations would be discussed until the NEPA process is completed. However he was interested, and Bill Cass had concurred, that early ROW consultations for appraisals, etc. could be conducted. Ken Herrick indicated the Albacore Park board does not think the permitted road use will be altered and anticipates that the property will change hands. The State has asked for another 6 month easement, but Ken Herrick indicates there will probably be no additional easement extensions and until NHDOT owns the property.

Ken Herrick stated, although premature, the Sarah Mildred Long project is closing the Section 106 process associated with Albacore Park, which initial draft results recommended a no adverse effect determination on the Albacore property. In fact, there will be effects pertaining to the necessary slope easements. Ken Herrick understands that Albacore Park does not have 4f status as a private entity. The board notified NH SHPO and sent a letter that they will not object to the no adverse effect determination, although they realize NHDHR will proceed with this adverse determination effect. Laura Black indicated the NHDHR has, for 2 years, indicated their finding of adverse effect.

Bob Landry asked if the Albacore Park Board will confirm through the regulatory process that they concur with the No Adverse Effect.

Vicki Chase noted that if they do not sign the lease again for the Albacore Connector Road, NHDOT will close the bypass.

Jaime Sikora noted however that the NEPA process has to be completed before any formal ROW acquisition is completed.

Submitted by: Sheila Charles and Jill Edelmann, Cultural Resources